

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

CASE NUMBER: 13-20371

HONORABLE VICTORIA A. ROBERTS

v.

DOREEN HENDRICKSON,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

On August 23, 2013, the Court entered an Order denying Doreen Hendrickson's motion to dismiss indictment. On September 6, 2013, Hendrickson filed a motion for reconsideration, claiming the Court erred when it declined to grant her motion. The Court **DENIES** Hendrickson's motion for reconsideration.

In its discretion, the Court can grant a motion for reconsideration if it is demonstrated that a palpable defect misled the Court in its ruling, correction of which would result in a different disposition. E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(3); See E.D. Mich. LCrR 12.1(a) (providing that criminal motions are governed by Local Rule 7.1).

"It is an exception to the norm for the Court to grant a motion for reconsideration." *Maiberger v. City of Livonia*, 724 F. Supp. 2d 759, 780 (E.D. Mich. 2010). "[A]bsent a significant error that changes the outcome of a ruling on a motion, the Court will not provide a party with an opportunity to relitigate issues already decided." *Id.* Palpable defects are those which are "obvious, clear, unmistakable,

manifest or plain." *Mich. Dep't of Treasury v. Michalec*, 181 F. Supp. 2d 731, 734 (E.D. Mich. 2002).

In her motion Hendrickson presents no papable defect; rather, she rehashes her arguments with the Court. The motion is **DENIED**.

**IT IS ORDERED.**

S/Victoria A. Roberts

Victoria A. Roberts

United States District Judge

Dated: September 24, 2013

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record and Doreen M. Hendrickson by electronic means or U.S. Mail on September 24, 2013.

S/Carol A. Pinegar

Deputy Clerk